

we can start to make the kinds of choices which I believe brought most of us to the chamber—some sense of responsibility for the economic health of the nation and for the less advantaged people in the nation. We could start to help those who need help. Surely our electorate did not send us here to make the choice that their dollars should be used on a priority basis for the purchase of service stations rather than for the provision of education, health care or pensions. Surely we did not come here with that in mind and we do not run campaigns on that basis.

Then why should we feel any sense of compulsion to stand in the chamber today and support the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in his determination to use the dollars of taxpayers on a priority basis to purchase things that we do not need as a nation rather than to use tax dollars to purchase and to provide things which are really necessary in the nation?

The Conservative Party rang the bells of the House for 16 days for several reasons, but the primary one was to split Bill C-94, and it was split into eight parts. Once that split had occurred, we could call witnesses before a committee to help us know what was right and what was wrong with each of these eight pieces of legislation. The government acknowledges that there is a great deal wrong with Bill C-102 and Bill C-104. The House will get to those bills before much longer, but the government is proposing massive changes to the two pieces of legislation.

• (1620)

In the case of Bill C-101, the government, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the officials of Petro-Canada have ignored every piece of advice which was given to the committee. This legislation will become law in exactly the same manner as it was originally worded, unless the members in this Chamber decide collectively that it should not become law.

I moved a series of four amendments, but the first one, the replacement of the word "four" by the word "two", is the significant amendment in regard to saving the consumers of Canada some money and in restoring a philosophy of public expenditures which puts people ahead of pride. It is a philosophy which puts people ahead of the minister, and I urge members of this Chamber to vote for this amendment. I look forward to the opportunity of bringing the three remaining amendments to the attention of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Petro-Canada Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the amendment defeated on division.

The question is now on amendment No. 2.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. What Bill C-101 says is that the equity capital for Canada shall be issued in the form of shares, each of which is worth \$100,000. I would hope that members of the House would see the day where, in the best interest of the taxpayers of Canada, they would want to sell some of those shares to Canadians to get back some of the invested money and use it for other purposes. The effect of my amendment would simply be to change the par value of those shares from \$100,000 each to \$100.00 each. This would be an amount that many Canadians could afford. Some day in the future, instead of the government owning all those shares, if we wanted individual Canadians to own part of that company, we could sell them those shares at \$100.00 par value, rather than restrict the sale to large corporations which can afford to pay \$100,000.

Perhaps there is a member of the Liberal Party who could afford one share at \$100,000, but I could not afford it and I do not believe most of the members of my caucus could either. I know that most of my constituents and, in fact, very few Canadians could afford that amount.

All we are asking for in this amendment, which I hope all hon. members will agree with, is to provide an opportunity for every Canadian to participate in Petro-Canada at some future date. This amendment does not change the total amount; it just makes the issuance of the shares worth \$100.00 each instead of \$100,00 each. That would provide an opportunity for the average Canadian to participate in Petro-Canada instead of just the big multinationals or large corporations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

I declare the amendment defeated on division.

The question is now on amendment No. 3.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, this amendment is simply to help the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It is very brief. The way in which the clause is now worded requires the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to do something with which he may not agree. All that we on this side of the House are attempting to do is to allow the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to have some option by replacing the word "shall", which in legal terms is a requirement, with the word "may", which would provide a